UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/098,567	03/18/2002	Kyoko Makino	220962US2S	3188

22850 7590 02/06/2006

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER	
RIES, LAURIE ANNE	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2176	

DATE MAILED: 02/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/098,567	MAKINO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Laurie Ries	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 November 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *17,18,20-25,27 and 30-32* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *17,18,20-25,27 and 30-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *11 June 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Request for Continued Examination, filed 25 November 2005, to the original application filed 18 March 2002.

2. The rejection of claims 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, has been removed as necessitated by amendment.

3. The rejection of claims 16, 26, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reed (U.S. Patent 6,397,209 B1) in view of Yanase (U.S. Publication 2001/0025288 A1) has been removed as necessitated by amendment.

4. The rejection of claims 17-25, 27-28, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reed (U.S. Patent 6,397,209 B1) in view of Yanase (U.S. Publication 2001/0025288 A1), Thomson (U.S. Patent 5,634,051) and Chen (U.S. Patent 6,009,442) has been removed as necessitated by amendment and newly found prior art.

5. Claims 17-18, 20-25, 27, and 30-32 are pending. Claims 1-16, 19, 26, and 28-29 have been cancelled by Applicant. Applicant has added claims 31-32. Claims 17, 21, 27, 30, 31, and 32 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 17-18, 20, 22-25, 27, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reed (U.S. Patent 6,397,209 B1) in view of Yanase (U.S. Publication 2001/0025288 A1), Thomson (U.S. Patent 5,634,051) and Ching (U.S. Patent 6,978,420 B2).

As per claims 17, 27, and 30, Reed discloses a computer readable medium, system and method comprising referring to term definition dictionary data including summary elements defined as elements to be extracted in order to be included in summaries (See Reed, Figure 2, element 2, and Column 3, lines 5-64). Reed also discloses a computer readable medium, system, and method including referring to term definition dictionary data including summary elements defined as elements to be extracted in order to be included in summaries (See Reed, Figure 2, element 2, and Column 3, lines 5-64), extracting the summary elements included in document data to be analyzed (See Reed, Column 4,lines 16-55), and linking a number of corresponding descriptions in the document data to be analyzed with the summary information (See

Reed, Column 6, lines 13-20, lines 24-42, lines 59-60, and Column 2, lines 3-15). Reed also discloses when a designation of the summary information from a user is received, searching the document data to be analyzed corresponding to the designated summary information based on a link result between the document data to be analyzed and the summary information (See Reed, Column 3,lines 5-8, lines 15-35, and Column 4, lines 56-65). Reed also discloses searching the document data to be analyzed and searching the summary information corresponding to the searched document data to be analyzed based on the link result between the document data to be analyzed and the summary information (See Reed, Column 3, lines 5-8, lines 15-35, and Column 4, lines 56-65). Reed does not disclose expressly that the extracted summary elements are combined in accordance with a predetermined rule to generate a number of summary information of the document data to be analyzed, where the summary information are combinations of the extracted summary elements. Reed also does not disclose expressly generating screen data including the designated summary information and the searched document data to be analyzed, and generating screen data that makes the user hierarchically designate search keys for user in a search of the document data to be analyzed. Yanase discloses a number of summary elements that are combinations of extracted summary elements, such as article titles and article text summary portions from multiple articles. Yanase discloses that that summary element are extracted based on predetermined rules, such as defining separators and spaces (See Yanase, Page 4, paragraphs 0079-0083, and Figure 8). Thomson discloses generating screen data including the search document data, the category under which

the searched document data falls, and a portion of the document as determined by the user. (See Thomson, Column 2, lines 65-67, Column 3, lines 1-3, and Figure 3). Ching discloses displaying document summary information resulting from a search (See Ching, Column 3,lines 40-42). Ching also discloses generating screen data including documents to be search in hierarchies where a user designates a key phrase for use in a search of the document data at a particular hierarchical level (See Ching, Column 3, lines 28-42, and Column 11, lines 20-34). Reed, Yanase, Thomson and Ching are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing and presenting electronic documents. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the number of summary information made up of combinations of extracted summary elements that are extracted based on predetermined rules of Yanase with the system and method of Reed. The motivation for doing so would have been to determine the separation between various types of information within documents, such as titles and body of text (See Yanase, Page 4, paragraph 0080), and to allow the user to access additional document data which is not displayed on the screen due to a restricted display area (See Yanase, Page 6, paragraph 0116). It also would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the search method and generation of screen data of Thomson and Ching with the system and method of Reed. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to enter a description of the information needed using simple words or phrases and to rely on the system to generate the full search query (See Thomson, Column 6, lines 35-46), subsequently displaying the results to the user on the screen

including the summary data in order to allow the user to efficiently identify and view only those segments within the documents that contain a key phrase on which the documents are cross-referenced (See Ching, Column 1, lines 42-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Yanase, Thomson and Ching with Reed for the benefit of distinguishing between data segments within a document and accessing additional data within a document, and for allowing a user to enter information from which a full search is formulated and the results presented to the user to obtain the invention as specified in claims 17, 27, and 30.

As per claim 18, Reed, Yanase, Thomson and Ching disclose the limitations of claim 17 as described above. Thomson also discloses characterizing portions of the document data to be analyzed, which corresponds to the summary information, included in the screen data (See Thomson, Column 7, lines 52-53). Reed, Yanase, Thomson and Ching are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing and presenting electronic documents. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the characterized portions of the document data to be analyzed of Thomson with the system and method of Reed, Yanase, Thomson and Ching. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to request to view a complete document selected from the list by inputting a command indicative of this request (See Thomson, Column 7, lines 53-57). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Thomson with Reed, Yanase, Thomson and Ching for the benefit of allowing the user to request a complete document to obtain the invention as specified in claim 18.

As per claim 20, Reed, Yanase, Thomson and Ching disclose the limitations of claim 17 as described above. Thomson also discloses, when a search key in an arbitrary hierarchy is designated by the user, generating the screen data that makes the user designate a next search key from a search key in a hierarchy of an order lower than the arbitrary hierarchy and the search key in the arbitrary hierarchy (See Thomson, Column 6,lines 63-64). Thomson also discloses, when a search key in an arbitrary hierarchy is designated by the user, searching the document data based on the search key designated in the arbitrary hierarchy and a search key designated in a hierarchy of an order higher than the arbitrary hierarchy before the arbitrary hierarchy is designated (See Thomson, Column 6, lines 61-62). Reed, Yanase, Thomson and Ching are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing and presenting electronic documents. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the designation of a next search key in a hierarchical order either lower or higher than the arbitrary hierarchy of Thomson with the system and method of Reed, Yanase, Thomson and Ching. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to execute search strategies using a broader or narrower concept (See Thomson, Column 7, lines 23-26, and Column 6, lines 61-64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Thomson with Reed, Yanase, Thomson, and Ching for the benefit of allowing the user to execute varying levels of concepts to search to obtain the invention as specified in claim 20.

As per claim 22, Reed, Yanase, Thomson and Ching disclose the limitations of claim 17 as described above. Reed also discloses including index information indicative

of a category under which the document data falls (See Reed, Column 3,lines 5-8, and lines 15-35). Reed also discloses, when a designation of the category from the user is received, searching the document data that falls under the designated category based on the index information (See Reed, Column 3, lines 5-8, and lines 15-35), and searching the summary information corresponding to the searched document data based on the link result between the document data and the summary information (See Reed, Column 4, lines 56-65). Thomson also discloses generating the screen data including the searched document data, the category under which the searched document data falls, and the extracted summary information (See Reed, Column 3,lines 5-8, and lines 15-35). Reed, Yanase, Thomson and Ching are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing and presenting electronic documents. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the generation of screen data of Thomson with the system and method of Reed, Yanase, Thomson and Ching. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to enter a description of the information needed using simple words or phrases and to rely on the system to generate the full search query (See Thomson, Column 6, lines 35-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Thomson with Reed, Yanase, Thomson and Ching for the benefit of allowing the user to enter a description of the information needed using simple words or phrases and to rely on the system to generate the full search query to obtain the invention as specified in claim 22.

As per claims 23 and 25, Reed, Yanase, Thomson and Ching disclose the limitations of claim 22 as described above. Thomson also discloses generating the screen data that makes the user hierarchically designate the category and the summary information, searching the document data that satisfies a search condition generated based on the designation from the user, and generating the screen data including the searched document data, the category under which the searched document data falls, and the searched summary information (See Thomson, Column 6, lines 47-60, Column 2, lines 65-67, Column 3, lines 1-3, and Figure 3). Thomson also discloses searching the document data based on the category or the summary information designated in the arbitrary hierarchy and the category or summary information designated in a hierarchy of an order higher than the arbitrary hierarchy before the arbitrary hierarchy is designated (See Thomson, Column 6, lines 61-62). Reed, Yanase, Thomson and Ching are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing and presenting electronic documents. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the hierarchical designation of search keys by the user and searching of the document data based on the category of Thomson with the system and method of Reed, Yanase, Thomson, and Ching. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to examine the search results in multiple formats (See Thomson, Column 2, lines 65-67, and Column 3, lines 1-3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Thomson with Reed, Yanase, Thomson and Ching for the benefit of allowing the user to examine the search results in multiple formats to obtain the invention as specified in claims 23 and 25.

Claim 24 is rejected on the same basis as claim 20

7. Claims 21 and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reed (U.S. Patent 6,397,209 B1) in view of Rodenburg (U.S. Patent 6,845,369 B1), Yanase (U.S. Publication 2001/0025288 A1), Thomson (U.S. Patent 5,634,051) and Ching (U.S. Patent 6,978,420 B2).

As per claims 21, 31, and 32, Reed discloses a computer readable medium, system and method including extracting the summary elements included in document data to be analyzed (See Reed, Column 4, lines 16-55), linking a number of corresponding descriptions in the document data to be analyzed with the summary information (See Reed, Column 6, lines 13-20, lines 24-42, lines 59-60, and Column 2, lines 3-15), when a designation of the summary information from a user is received, searching the document data to be analyzed corresponding to the designated summary information based on a link result between the document data to be analyzed and the summary information (See Reed, Column 3, lines 5-8, lines 15-35, and Column 4, lines 58-65), and searching the document data to be analyzed and searching the summary information corresponding to the searched document data to be analyzed based on the link result between the document data to be analyzed and the summary information (See Reed, Column 3,lines 5-8, lines 15-35, and Column 4, lines 56-65). Reed does not disclose expressly referring to term definition dictionary data including summary elements, combining extract summary elements in accordance with a predetermined

rule, and generating screen data that makes a user hierarchically designate search keys for use in a search of the document data to be analyzed. Rodenburg discloses referring to term definition dictionary data in order to create an index of portions of documents (See Rodenburg, Column 3, lines 59-67). Yanase discloses a number of summary elements that are combinations of extracted summary elements, such as article titles and article text summary portions from multiple articles. Yanase discloses that that summary element are extracted based on predetermined rules, such as defining separators and spaces (See Yanase, Page 4, paragraphs 0079-0083, and Figure 8). Thomson discloses generating screen data including the search document data, the category under which the searched document data falls, and a portion of the document as determined by the user. (See Thomson, Column 2, lines 65-67, Column 3, lines 1-3, and Figure 3). Ching discloses displaying document summary information resulting from a search (See Ching, Column 3,lines 40-42). Ching also discloses generating screen data including documents to be search in hierarchies where a user designates a key phrase for use in a search of the document data at a particular hierarchical level (See Ching, Column 3, lines 28-42, and Column 11, lines 20-34). Reed, Rodenburg, Thomson, Yanase and Ching are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing and presenting electronic documents. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the term definition dictionary of Rodenburg with the system and method of Reed. The motivation for doing so would have been to display to the user only portions of documents pertinent to a specific topic (See Rodenburg, Column 3,lines 61-65). At the

time of the invention it would also have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the number of summary information made up of combinations of extracted summary elements that are extracted based on predetermined rules of Yanase with the system and method of Reed and Rodenburg. The motivation for doing so would have been to determine the separation between various types of information within documents, such as titles and body of text (See Yanase, Page 4, paragraph 0080), and to allow the user to access additional document data which is not displayed on the screen due to a restricted display area (See Yanase, Page 6, paragraph 0116). It also would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the search method and generation of screen data of Thomson and Ching with the system and method of Reed, Rodenburg and Yanase. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to enter a description of the information needed using simple words or phrases and to rely on the system to generate the full search query (See Thomson, Column 6, lines 35-46), subsequently displaying the results to the user on the screen including the summary data in order to allow the user to efficiently identify and view only those segments within the documents that contain a key phrase on which the documents are cross-referenced (See Ching, Column 1, lines 42-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Rodenburg, Yanase, Thomson and Ching with Reed for the benefit of distinguishing between data segments within a document and accessing additional data within a document, and for allowing a user to enter information from which a full search is formulated and the results presented to the user to obtain the invention as specified in claims 21, 31, and 32.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 17-18, 20-25, 27, and 30-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Mase (U.S. Patent 5,978,820) discloses a text summarizing method and system.
- Li (U.S. Patent 6,631,496 B1) discloses a system for personalizing, organizing, and managing web information.
- Pitkow (U.S. Publication 2002/0016786 A1) discloses a system and method for searching and recommending objects from a categorically organized information repository.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR

William L. Bashore

WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
2/1/2006